

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

December 3, 1999
8:30 a.m.

Hilton Seattle Airport
SeaTac, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
John Roskelley	Spokane
Stu Trefry	Designee, Conservation Commission (morning session)
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission (afternoon session)
Tom Fitzsimmons	Director, Department of Ecology
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Shari Schaftlein	Designee, Department of Transportation

A tape of the meeting's proceedings is retained by IAC as the formal record of the meeting.

Call to Order

Chair Ruckelshaus called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. and welcomed Board members and the audience, introducing Shari Schaftlein who will be representing WSDOT today and noted that Stu Trefry will be representing the Conservation Commission.

Topic #1. Review and Approval of Minutes

Larry Cassidy **moved** adoption of minutes from November 17, 1999, John Roskelley **seconded. Motion Carried.**

Topic #2. Scheduling Meetings for 2000

Suggested meeting dates were accepted by the Board with the exception of the May and October meeting dates and choice of July 12 and 13, no meeting in August. Staff will work with the Chair to find possible alternatives for the May and October dates and bring the proposal to the next meeting.

Larry Cassidy **moved** adoption of meeting schedule for 2000 as revised, John Roskelley **seconded. Motion Carried.**

Topic #3. Management and Status Reports

Debra Wilhelmi reviewed the financial and management services memo and attachments (see meeting materials). The SRFB will be receiving \$18 million in Federal Funds this year and \$30.84 million in State funds for the biennium.

Eric Johnson reviewed the Project Services Division report (see meeting materials). Eric introduced the project managers, as ambassadors for the Board across the state. The project managers are: Rollie Geppert, Lynn Palensky, and Marc Duboiski. There are two meetings scheduled to help both Lead Entities and non-Lead Entities learn the process to be used in the early 2000 grant cycle. The first meeting will be held on December 14, 1999, in Renton, Washington and will target the Lead Entity process. The second meeting is scheduled for December 16, 1999, at the Grant County Courthouse in Ephrata; this meeting will be focused on the application process to be used by those applicants in non-Lead Entity WRIAs. The Project Services staff will also be available to assist applicants one-on-one if necessary.

Brenda McMurray requested the meeting location be changed from Grant County to Ellensburg to be in closer proximity to the greatest number of applicants. (Staff made the change.)

Mr. Ruckelshaus discussed the variability in Lead Entity maturity from Lead Entities doing a first rate job to areas where no Lead Entities exist. The Board needs to make sure they honor the Lead Entity process that has been set up but also take the initiative to assist the Lead Entities and coordinate with Department of Fish and Wildlife in working with these groups. The Board and staff need to support and strengthen the Lead Entity process by developing models showing what a good Lead Entity looks like. This is a topic the Board will be discussing in the future.

Topic #4. Forests and Fish

Mr. Ruckelshaus recused himself from this topic due to his directorship with the Weyerhaeuser Company and asked Larry Cassidy to take the chair during this discussion.

Curt Smitch from the Governor's Office presented the request for \$4 million on behalf of the Governor, the Joint Natural Resources Cabinet, and Salmon Recovery Office to begin implementation of the Forests and Fish Agreement (see meeting materials packet for copy of letter and background information). Curt explained that this Agreement is the result of a nearly three year negotiation that was a scientifically rigorous, multi-party process that will have direct benefits to salmon species across the state helping to meet both Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act requirements. The Salmon Recovery Funding Board's support of this process would also increase the confidence to those beginning the Agriculture, Fish, and Water process that will begin on December 9, 1999.

Brenda McMurray and John Roskelley both voiced concern with the amount of public input this Agreement had during the three-year process. Craig Partridge, Curt Smitch,

Jim Peters, and Tom Fitzsimmons all elaborated on the process, indicating there was ample public and stakeholder input and involvement.

Catherine Elliott, Forest Practices Division Manager, Department of Natural Resources elaborated on the process questions and next steps, stating that the hope is to have the emergency rules in place by March 20, 2000, and the draft Environmental Statement will go to the Forest Practices Board by April.

Public Testimony:

Marcie Johnson Golde, Washington Environmental Council, handed out a letter from the WEC (see meeting materials). She then highlighted information in the letter and discussed the WEC's position on the Forests and Fish Agreement. WEC believes that the Forests and Fish Agreement is inadequate to protect and restore salmon and clean water in Washington's forested watersheds. Nevertheless, they feel additional funding is needed for forestry programs. They also feel that the SRFB should de-emphasize programmatic funding and resist back-filling funding for basic agency responsibilities such as monitoring and enforcement, which the legislature has an obligation to fund.

Guy McMinds, Quinault Indian Tribe, stated that the tribes are worried about the enforcement of this agreement.

Jim Priest, Colville Confederated Tribes, supports the TFW collaborative process and will also be attending the AFW process. The Colville Tribe would like to see this process move forward and to get the work going on the ground.

Tim Boyd, Washington Forest Protection Association, noted that the reason Washington State received as much federal salmon recovery money as we did was due to the Forests and Fish Agreement.

Curt Smitch made closing comments on the request for \$4 million stating that they really need an answer today or at least a timeframe in which a decision will be made.

After more discussion by the Board consensus was reached that the Board will approve the \$4 million request with a contract negotiated by the IAC staff to be brought back to the Board at the January 21 meeting for final approval. The goal is to get the best return for this money by fully funding portions of the Agreement (i.e. the data system and monitoring). There will also be a letter from the Chair to the Legislature requesting more funding for agency staff to implement the various salmon recovery efforts needed.

Brenda McMurray would like to include the request for the Legislature to meet with the SRFB to discuss the salmon recovery funding needs further.

Passed unanimously.

Topic #7: Scoping Document

Jim Kramer reviewed this document noting changes and corrections made since the last meeting.

Public Testimony

Will Hall, Snohomish County, discussed the distinction between Lead Entities and WRIAs stating that Snohomish County has two separate WRIA processes going under the same Lead Entity and would like to submit two separate lists. He also asked whether State Agencies were eligible for funding during this grant cycle since they did not allow State Agencies to apply in their area. *(Yes, State Agencies are eligible for funding in this grant cycle.)*

Judith G. Noble, Watershed ESA Coordinator WRIA 9 city of Seattle, had concern with the definition of Lead Entity. *(Board members agreed that a definition of Lead Entity be added to the Scoping Document in the next revision.)*

Board members agreed that this is a working document and will continue to be revised as time goes on. This document will be included in the documents given to the SRFB at each meeting.

The topic of funding legally required activities was discussed. There are many types of projects that could fall under this category such as sediment reduction, screens, culverts, and many others. The Board may want to require a higher match on some of these projects or other special conditions. The SRFB would like to have a legal analysis of funding projects that are legally required. This question will also need to be brought to the Legislature for guidance on this issue.

Topic #5: Criteria: Lead Entity/No Lead Entity

Jim Kramer and Jim Fox went through the paper on Lead Entity and Non-Lead Entity evaluation criteria. The Board discussed the need for more explanation on the point process, level of points given for required monitoring efforts, and need to add future goals into the evaluation.

Public Testimony

Jay Watson, Executive Director, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, discussed the need for a Lead Entity evaluation process but also the need for a better description of what a Lead Entity is and is not. Jay also noted that it is vital to keep the door open for state agencies to apply for funding and that the individual project match is problematic in some areas and could be a killer of some very good projects. He requested the Board to reconsider this requirement in the next funding cycle.

John Cambalik, Salmon Restoration Coordinator, North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity Group, agrees with Jay on the match. He also requested the Board get information out as early as possible for the Fall 2000 grant cycle. If the Board will not be funding assessment, planning, or monitoring projects then they need to find another way to fund this type of project.

After public testimony, the Board discussed the need to make sure Lead Entities know that the Board would like to see the full list of projects needed in their WRIA even

though they won't be able to fund all of the projects. Also, at the upcoming workshops the staff need to discuss more creative ways for the applicants to come up with the match money. Sometimes the project applicants don't think of all the ways to meet match requirements such as providing donated time and equipment.

Topic #6: Final Application and Evaluation Process Review

Debra Wilhelmi went through the application packets. The Lead Entity Evaluation form will need more directions up front and staff are continuing to revise this document. The application form, if approved by the Board, is in its final form for this grant cycle. After Debra went through the application and sample application the only requested change was with the word "development". The Board would like to see the word development changed to restoration or to have more description on what development means in this application. Chair Ruckelshaus praised the work on the application and thanked Debra for all her hard work in getting this information ready in such a short time.

Topic #8: Programmatic Activities – Policy Issues

Jim Fox went through the document concerning programmatic funding.

Topic #9: Programmatic Activities – Recommendations on 13 "Vetoed Items"

Public Testimony

Willy O'Neil, Associated General Contractors of Washington, went through the handout he provided the Board and gave general guidance on requests for proposals.

Jeff Breckel, Executive Director, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, is concerned with waiting until April to find out about funding. The LCFRB would like a decision on the \$250,000 in funding for the LCFRB. April 2000 is too long to wait for some of the programmatic decisions. The SRFB needs to meet with the legislature to discuss the programmatic dilemma.

The SRFB will get back on programmatic funds to the LCFRB at the January 21, 2000, meeting. Brenda voiced concern in funding the LCFRB when there are other Lead Entity groups out there that are not requesting additional funds yet but may in the future.

The Board will have programmatic funding on the January 21 agenda with a decision at that time. The Board needs to have more detail on the status of the currently funded programs. Staff will get this information together and get the information to the Board at least one week prior to the next meeting.

Topic #10: Inventory Projects (5 Proposals)

The inventory project sponsors requested a decision on funding these projects. Following discussion, the Board decided to not vote on this issue.

Public Testimony

Paul Sekulich, WDFW, informed the Board that criteria has been developed on how to fund this type of project and a list has been developed with the highest priorities across the state.

Jim Kramer asked for a copy of this prioritized list.

Legislative Issues:

There are two topics that need working with the Legislature. Some guidance will be needed on the programmatic issues topic and on funding of legally required projects. Laura Johnson will work with the Assistant Attorney General and the Governor's Office on this issue prior to the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at about 4:00 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: January 21, 2000 (Spokane)
 February 17-18, 2000 (Bremerton)
 March 16-17, 2000 (Wenatchee)
 April 20-21, 2000 (Bellingham)

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\December 3 1999\12_3_99Minutes.doc